IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	
	:	
v.	:	**CRIMINAL NO. 20-299-1**
	:	
WILLIAM MACK	:	

ORDER

AND NOW this 24th day of January, 2024, upon consideration of Petitioner William Mack's Motion to Vacate, Set Aside, or Correct a Sentence Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (Doc. Nos. 110, 112, 117), and the Government's opposition brief (Doc. No. 118), it is **ORDERED** as follows:

1. The Motion (Doc. Nos. 110, 112, and 117) is **DENIED.**

2. There is no probable cause to issue a certificate of appealability.[1]

3. The Clerk of Court shall mark this matter **CLOSED.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/*Karen Spencer Marston*

KAREN SPENCER MARSTON, J.

[1] Because jurists of reason would not debate the procedural or substantive dispositions of Petitioner's claims, no certificate of appealability should be granted. *See Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000) ("Where a district court has rejected the constitutional claims on the merits, the showing required to satisfy § 2253(c) is straightforward: The petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong. . . . When the district court denies a habeas petition on procedural grounds without reaching the prisoner's underlying constitutional claim, a COA should issue when the prisoner shows, at least, that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling.").